

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/966,564	09/27/2001	Robert H. Halstead JR.	2682.2018-000	3785	
James M. Smith, Esq. HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. Two Militia Drive Lexington, MA 02421-4799			EXAMINER		
			AMINI, JAVID A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2672	11	
			DATE MAILED: 08/05/2004	1AILED: 08/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
•	09/966,564	HALSTEAD, ROBI	HALSTEAD, ROBERT H.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Javid A Amini	2672	_	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence ad	dress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of tho dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC tute, cause the application to become a	a reply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely  DNTHS from the mailing date of this co  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
	his action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde	vance except for formal ma	• •	merits is	
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on September 27, 2002  Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrupt 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a) accepted or b he drawing(s) be held in abeya rection is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in riority documents have bee eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National	Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/01/2002.	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) b(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTC	)-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/966,564

Art Unit: 2672

Application/Control Number: 09/966,564 Page 2

Page 2

Art Unit: 2672

## Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman, 11* F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi,* 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re van Ornum,* 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel,* 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (c) maybe used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-48 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being; unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,750 Bl. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Applicant in independent claims in the present application discloses that "subtracting the second size preference from the first size preference, resulting in a resultant size preference dependent on the size preferences of the graphical objects". And also Applicant on page 3, lines 14-16 discloses that "various operation can be applied to the graphical objects, such as the add, max, and divide operations described in U.S. patent application serial no. 09/364,470 ...."

(i.e. The 6,667,750 B 1). A person skilled in the art will comprehend that there is no subtraction operation in referred application serial no. 09/364,470. Contrary, Applicant in the U.S. Patent No. 6,667,750 B1 in col. 6, line 25 disclosed that other operators, such as "subtract," could also be envisioned. Therefore, the following underlined from claim 1 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,667,750 B1 could be considered as a subtract operation.

Portion of the claim 1 consists of "computing size values of the graphical objects along the second dimension from the preferred sizes and elasticities of the graphical objects along the second dimension". Claims 3, 15, 27 and 39 are rejected as being obvious to a person skilled in the art to comprehend the size of the resultant size has a min. value of zero.

/ . · · ·

Application/Control Number: 09/966,564

Art Unit: 2672

Page 3

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Javid A Amini whose telephone number is 703-605-4248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on 703-305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application
Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from.
either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you
have questions on access to the Private PAIR. system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at
866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Javid A Amini Examiner Art Unit 2672

Javid Amini

JEFFERY BRIEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

John a. Bries